

REMARKS

Applicants request entry of this amendment, reconsideration and allowance. In response to the June 14, 2006 Office Action, Applicants respond to the Examiner's detailed action with the following remarks according to the Examiner's communication. Claims 10, 12-19, 21-33, 35 and 36 are currently pending, and Examiner has rejected all the claims.

1-2. Applicants acknowledge Examiner's withdrawal of the finality of the rejection based on the filing of a request for continued examination filed with an amendment.

3-4. Examiner has rejected claims 10, 14, 19, and 33 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Applicants have amended the claims to particularly point out and distinctly claim the invention in compliance with §112. Specifically, Applicants have amended the claims to point out that the molded housing follows the contours of the bent or inclined portions of the leads. The amendments only clarify the subject matter of the claimed invention; the amendments do not add new matter, and therefore no new issues are presented.

5-6. Examiner has rejected claims 10, 14-15, 19, 25, and 26 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,043,111 (Furuse). "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." MPEP §2131. Applicants respectfully disagree with Examiner's rejection and respectfully request reconsideration.

Applicants have amended claims 10, 14, and 19 to further clarify the claimed subject matter. Applicants have amended the claims to clarify that the molded housing fully covers the bent or inclination portions of the leads, and that the molding housing follows the contours of the leads, thereby increasing creepage distance. Furuse teaches the use of a device that has a molded housing that is solid and rectangular. The device of the application has a package that is not fully rectangular, but that follows the contours of

the inclined or bent regions of the leads in order to increase creepage distance between leads. Therefore, Furuse does not anticipate rejected claims 10, 14, and 19, because Furuse does not teach a device where the package follows the contours of the leads.

Since Furuse does not anticipate claims 14 and 19, Furuse cannot anticipate claim 15, which depends from claim 14, and claims 24 and 25, which depend from claim 19. Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 10, 14-15, 19, and 24-25 are in condition for allowance.

7-8. Claims 12, 16, 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Furuse. “To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.” MPEP §2143. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the §103(a) rejection because the cited reference does not establish a prima facie case of obviousness.

Claims 10 and 14, from which claims 12, 16, and 18 depend, respectively, are distinct from the device taught by Furuse for the reasons stated above. With respect to 12 and 16, Examiner states that it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to, at the time the invention was made, increase the distance between the leads as claimed. However, the deficiencies of Furuse are not addressed, and therefore, Applicants respectfully argue that claims 12 and 16 are not rendered obvious by Furuse.

Claim 14, from which claim 18 depends, again, is distinct from the device taught by Furuse as stated above. The APA teaches a frame pad integral with its leads and a molding housing that does not fully cover the bent portions of the leads. The APA does not teach the elements and limitations lacking in Furuse. Applicants argue that claim 18 is not rendered obvious by Furuse in combination of the APA, as the APA does not make up for the deficiencies of Furuse. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the references do not teach or suggest all the claim limitations to establish a case of obviousness.

Applicants therefore respectfully submit that Claims 12, 16, and 18 are in condition for allowance.

9. Claims 13, 17, 22-23, 29-30, 33, 35, and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Furuse in view of the APA. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the §103(a) rejection because the cited references do not establish a prima facie case of obviousness.

Claim 10, 14, 19, and 33, from which Claims 13, 17, 22-23, and 29-30, 35, and 36 depend, respectively, are distinct from the device taught by Furuse for the reasons stated above, and the device taught by the APA, for the reasons stated above, does not overcome these deficiencies. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that the rejected claims are in condition for allowance.

10. Claims 21, 24, and 27-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Furuse in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,859,387 (Gagnon). Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the §103(a) rejection because the cited references do not establish a prima facie case of obviousness.

Claim 19, from which claims 21, 24, and 27-28 depend, is distinct from Furuse for the reasons stated above. Gagnon, of record, also teaches a device that has a solid package housing that does not follow the contours of the leads, which does not increase creepage distance as does the device of the application. Accordingly, there is no motivation or suggestion to combine Gagnon with Furuse. Further, however, the references combined do not teach the elements of the claimed inventions of claim 19, and therefore cannot render obvious the claims depending from claim 19, as they lack the formation of molded housing following the contour of the leads. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 21, 24, and 27-28 are in condition for allowance.

11. Claims 31-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Furuse in view of the APA and Gagnon. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the §103(a) rejection because the cited references do not establish a prima facie case of obviousness.

Appl. No. 10/762,075
Resp. Dated September 14, 2006.
Reply to Office Action of June 14, 2006

Claim 33, from which claims 31 and 32 depend, is distinct for the reasons stated above, and it is also argued that for the reasons mentioned above the APA and Gagnon do not make up for these deficiencies. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 31 and 32 are in condition for allowance.

In sum, Applicants believe that all the claims as amended do not add new matter and therefore do not present any new issues, and also are all in condition for a allowance. Applicants respectfully request issuance of a notice of allowance in the pending case.

Applicants appreciate the opportunity to call the Examiner but believe that this amendment to the claims and the forgoing remarks fully address the issues raised by the Examiner. On the other hand, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney if he has any matters to address that will facilitate allowance of the application.

In the event that Applicants have overlooked the need for an extension of time, additional extension of time, payment of fee, or additional payment of fee, Applicants hereby conditionally petition therefore and authorize that any charges be made to Deposit Account No.: 50-3010.

Respectfully submitted,
HISCOCK & BARCLAY, LLP

By: 
Alpa V. Patel
Reg. No. 58,196
Attorney for Applicants
under 37 C.F.R. §1.34
2000 HSBC Plaza
Rochester, NY 14604
Tel: (585) 295-4438
Fax: (585) 295-8459